

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

MICHAEL MUEHL,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

09-cv-16-bbc

BELINDA SCHRUBBE, Health Service Manager;  
MARY SLINGER, Registered Nurse;  
FRAN JENNINGS, Registered Nurse;  
GAIL WALTZ, Registered Nurse;  
CHARLENE REITZ, Registered Nurse; and

Defendants.

---

In this case, plaintiff Michael Muehl is proceeding on his claims that defendants Schrubbe, Slinger, Reitz and Jennings failed to provide him with appropriate care for a MRSA infection and that defendants Reitz, Waltz and Schrubbe failed to provide him with appropriate care for his wounds after he cut himself. On June 2, 2009, plaintiff filed a pleading entitled “motion for answer to plaintiff’s complaint.” I understand him to be asking me to order the defendants to include more specific responses in their answer.

In his motion, plaintiff states that because defendants now have his medical records they can provide appropriate responses to the allegations in his complaint. However, Fed.

R. Civ. P.12(e), provides that a party may move for a more definite statement of a pleading to which a responsive pleading is allowed. A responsive pleading is not allowed to an answer. Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(a). The purpose of the answer is not provide plaintiff with detailed information about defendants' litigation strategy, but only to determine which of plaintiff's allegations defendants dispute. Defendants' answer serves that purpose. Therefore, I must deny plaintiff's motion for a more definite statement. Plaintiff says that he is unhappy that he has to use discovery to determine the defendants' position on the allegations in his complaint. However, this is the purpose of discovery, to obtain information concerning plaintiff's claims.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for more definite statement, dkt. # 34, is DENIED.

Entered this 5<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2009.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

---

BARBARA B. CRABB  
District Judge